



**Langley Research Center  
DIRECTIVES MANAGEMENT  
TRANSMITTAL SHEET**

**LAPD 7000.2**

**September 11, 2003**

---

**MATERIAL TRANSMITTED**

LAPD 7000.2, "Review Program for Langley Research Center (LaRC) Facility Projects"

**RECISION**

LAPD 7000.2, dated March 7, 2003.

**SUMMARY**

This directive has been revised to:

- Reformat directive to comply with NPG 1400.1, "NASA Directives System Procedures and Guidelines." Paragraphs affected that required content change:
  - 1 – Summary
  - 3 – Criteria
  - 4 – Policy
  - 5 – Review Objectives
  - 6 – Responsibility
  - 7 – General Requirements (Item/Responsibility)
  - 8 – Review Descriptions (Review Type/Function)
- Change "Deputy for Facility Systems" to "Deputy Director for Facility Systems" throughout the document.
- Change "Project Manager/Technical Project Engineer" to "Project Manager/Project Management Engineer" in paragraph 6, Responsibility.
- Add responsibilities to Other Competency, Assistant, or Associate Directors, and Design Review Chairperson.
- Paragraph 7, "General Requirements (Item/Responsibility) information incorporated into appropriate paragraphs or removed.
- Incorporate old paragraph 8, "Review Descriptions (Review Type/Function)" with the appropriate attachment.
- Add "Project Definition Rating Index (PDR) results" to Attachments A, B, and C
- Add "List of equipment to be added or removed from facility" after "Mock-ups, Breadboards, and/or Prototype Hardware," in Attachment D, section V, Final Design.



**LANGLEY  
POLICY  
DIRECTIVE**

**Directive: LAPD 7000.2**

**Effective Date: September 11, 2003**

**Expiration Date: September 11, 2008**

---

**Responsible Office:** ~~Systems Engineering Competency~~ **Research and Facilities  
Management Office**

**SUBJECT: Review Program for Langley Research Center (LaRC) Facility Projects**

**1. POLICY**

**a. General**

(1) This Center will conduct the following sequential set of reviews for facility projects covered by this directive:

(a~~1~~) Project Requirements Review (PRR).

(b~~2~~) Conceptual Design Review (CoDR).

(c~~3~~) Preliminary Design Review (PDR).

(d~~4~~) Critical Design Review (CDR).

(e~~5~~) Integrated Systems Review (ISR).

(f~~6~~) Operational Readiness Review (ORR).

(2) Attachments A-F describe the ~~reviews and their functions.~~ **detailed review objectives and provide sample agendas for each review.**

(3) The process for implementing the reviews is described in LMS-CP-5621, "Facility Systems Project Review."

(4) The Chairperson of each review or the cognizant Competency Director may also establish other special reviews to supplement the above reviews.

**b. Review Objectives**

(1) The primary objective of the above reviews is to enhance the probability of success of LaRC facility projects. This will be achieved using the cumulative knowledge of a team of engineers, scientists, and technicians who have been selected for their experience with the particular systems and functions involved. These reviews do not relieve the LaRC organization to which the project is assigned of the responsibility for the success of the project.

(2) The reviews will be comprehensive, covering the technical, cost, and schedule aspects of the project. ~~See Attachment G for general requirements.~~

~~e. — Criteria~~

~~The criteria stated herein are minimum requirements for reviews of the technical and management aspects of LaRC's facility projects. The requirements of this directive do not supersede other reviews imposed by NASA Headquarters, or replace the scientific and technical reviews conducted by LaRC organizations or committees such as:~~

c. Criteria

The criteria stated herein are minimum requirements for reviews of the technical and management aspects of LaRC's facility projects. The requirements of this directive do not supersede other reviews imposed by NASA Headquarters, or replace the scientific and technical reviews conducted by LaRC organizations or committees such as:

- (1) Institutional Review Board Reviews (see LAPD 1150.2, "Boards, Panels, Committees, Councils, and Teams").
- (2) The Executive Safety Board Reviews (see LAPD 1150.2).
- (3) Technical Merit and Feasibility Reviews.
- (4) Routine Line Organization Reviews.

## 2. APPLICABILITY

a. This directive applies to any facility project which involves unusual approaches or potentially high risk. Major Discrete and Research Projects are normally included, while Repair and the Environmental Compliance Programs normally are excluded. Application of this instruction to Rehabilitation and Modification Program and Minor Construction Program projects is made on a case-by-case basis. Facility projects to be included in this review program are determined by the Deputy Director ~~for RFMO for Facility Systems~~ in conjunction with the Competency Director for whom the project is being executed. Additional projects can be added by the Director, Office of Safety and Mission Assurance (OSMA) or the Director, ~~Systems Engineering Research and Facilities Management Office Competency (SECRFMO)~~. The reviews for facility projects not covered by this directive will be established by the Deputy Director ~~for RFMO for Facility Systems~~.

b. A determination of the applicability of this instruction will be made upon the receipt of funding for a Preliminary Engineering Report (PER). At that time, decisions relative to tailoring the review requirements of this directive will also be made.

## 3. AUTHORITY

- a. NPD 7330.1, "Approval Authorities for Facility Projects"
- b. NPD 8820.2, "Design and Construction of Facilities."
- c. NPD 8831.1, "Management of Facilities Maintenance."

- d. NPG 8820.2, "Facility Project Implementation Handbook"

#### 4. REFERENCES

- a. ~~NPD 7330.1, "Approval Authorities for Facility Projects"~~
- b. ~~NPD 8820.2, "Design and Construction of Facilities."~~
- e. ~~NPD 8831.1, "Management of Facilities Maintenance."~~
- d. ~~NPG 8820.2, "Facility Project Implementation Handbook"~~
- ae. NASA Software Management and Assurance Program (SMAP) Information System Life-Cycle and Documentation Standards Release 4.3.
- b~~f~~. LAPD 1150.2, "Boards, Panels, Committees, Councils, and Teams"
- c~~g~~. LAPD 1700.1, "Safety Program"
- d~~h~~. LAPD 1700.2, "Safety Assignments"
- e. LMS-CP-5621, "Facility Systems Project Review"
- f~~i~~. Langley Form 6, "Request for Action"

#### 5. RESPONSIBILITY

- a. Director, ~~RFMOSEC~~ and Cognizant Competency Director

Ensure the effective implementation of the design review process.

- b. Director, ~~SECRFMO~~

Select Chairperson in consultation with the ~~Deputy for Facility Systems~~ Deputy Director.

- c. Other Competency, Assistant, or Associate Directors

(1) Support the design review process including closure of ~~Requests for Action (RFA's)~~ ~~Items~~ as required.

(2) Furnish senior personnel experienced in the required technical disciplines to support the reviews

- d. Design Review Chairperson

(1) Appoint ~~Committee~~ Review Panel members. Organize each panel and draw support from NASA Headquarters, other Centers, industry, or other Federal agencies when applicable.

(2) Chair the review(s).

(3) Assign and close ~~Action Items~~RFA's.

e. ~~Committee~~Review Panel Members

(1) Review the materials provided prior to the design review.

(2) Originate and review ~~Action Items~~RFA's as appropriate.

f. Line Management

(1) Ensure that design review material meets the requirements of this directive.

(2) Ensure Action Items are properly addressed.

g. Project Manager/Project Management Engineer ~~r/Technical Project Engineer~~

(1) In conjunction with the Review Chairperson, establish the review agenda, using the sample agenda as a guide.

(2) Recommend Action Item assignee and a closure date to the Design Review Chairperson.

h. Design Review Secretary

(1) Schedule the Design Review.

(2) Document the Design Review proceedings.

(3) Serve as Action Item Coordinator.

## **6. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY**

None

## **7. MEASUREMENTS**

None

## **8. CANCELLATION**

LAPD 7000.2, dated March 7, 2003.

Delma C. Freeman, Jr.  
Acting Director

Attachments A - ~~G~~F

## PROJECT REQUIREMENTS REVIEW (PRR)

### a. Description

#### (1) Objective (PRR)

The objective of the PRR is to ensure that project objectives (especially research objectives) have been translated into definitive, verifiable, and unambiguous statements of requirements. The PRR will normally be scheduled prior to the initiation of the Preliminary Engineering Report (PER).

#### (2) Membership

- (a) Chairperson: As designated by the Director, RFMOSEC
- (b) Co-Chairperson: As designated by the Cognizant Competency Director
- (c) Secretary: Appointed by the Chairperson
- (d) Members: LaRC Safety Manager; Facility Safety Head; Facility Coordinator; Cognizant Organization Manager; Deputy Director for RFMO ~~for Facility Systems~~; Capital Investment Planning Office Program Manager; technical experts as appropriate.

### b. Sample Agenda

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Scope of Review  
Agenda

#### II. PROJECT OVERVIEW

Research/Programmatic Requirements and Project Justification  
New Capability/Performance Desired  
Project Scope - Construction of Facilities (CoF) Funded Portion  
Project Scope - Research and Development (R&D) Funded Portion

#### III. DESIGN REQUIREMENTS/CONSTRAINTS

Historic Preservation  
Interfaces  
Functional Requirement Changes Since Publication of Facility Requirements Document  
Site Selection  
Special Systems or Equipment  
Safety, Reliability, and Quality Assurance (SR&QA)  
Security  
Utilities  
Design Codes/Criteria

September 11, 2003

Attachment A to LAPD 7000.2

Operations and Maintenance

Design Loads/Environment

Geometric Lines

Hardware/Software

Environmental Impact

Accommodation for Persons with Disabilities

Human Engineering

[Project Definition Rating Index \(PDRI\) results](#)

#### IV. SUMMARY

## CONCEPTUAL DESIGN REVIEW (CoDR)

### a. Description

#### (1) Objective (CoDR)

The objective of the CoDR is to review the functional design requirements, design options, and recommended conceptual design to ensure a sound basis for a final design. The CoDR will normally be scheduled at 90 percent completion of the PER (see NPG 8820.2).

#### (2) Membership

(a) Chairperson: As designated by the Director, ~~SEC~~

(b) Secretary: Appointed by the Chairperson

(c) Members: LaRC Safety Manager; Facility Safety Head; Facility Coordinator; Cognizant Organization Manager; Deputy Director for RFMO ~~for Facility Systems~~; Capital Investment Planning Office Program Manager; technical experts as appropriate.

### b. Sample Agenda

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Scope of Review

Status of Conceptual Design (percent complete, earlier studies, and so forth)

Agenda

#### II. PROJECT OVERVIEW

Research/Programmatic Requirements and Project Justification

New Capability/Performance Desired

Project Scope - CoF Funded Portion

Project Scope - R&D Funded Portion

#### III. DESIGN REQUIREMENTS/CONSTRAINTS

Historic Preservation

Interfaces

Functional Requirement Changes Since Publication of Facility Requirements Document

Site Selection

Special Systems or Equipment

Safety, Reliability, and Quality Assurance (SR&QA)

Security

Utilities

Design Codes/Criteria

Operations and Maintenance

Design Loads/Environment



Geometric Lines  
Hardware/Software  
Environmental Impact  
Accommodation for Persons with Disabilities  
Human Engineering

#### IV. CONCEPTUAL DESIGN

Evaluation of Options  
Project Description (major elements/components) (preliminary Work Breakdown Structure)  
Site Description  
Architectural Concept  
Foundation/Structural/Mechanical/Electrical  
Concepts and Analyses  
Operations and Maintenance Considerations  
Design of Special Systems or Equipment  
Needed Additional Studies/Tests/Analyses  
Summary of How Design Tentatively Meets Requirements  
Areas of Design Concern/Uncertainty  
[Project Definition Rating Index \(PDRI\) results](#)

#### V. DESIGN VALIDATION APPROACH

Scope of Analyses (for example, thermal, controls, and so forth)  
Methods of Analysis (for example, handbook/-finite element/difference/controls simulation, and so forth)  
Component and Subsystem Testing

#### VI. SAFETY AND QUALITY ASSURANCE

Facility Energy Source Checklist  
Preliminary Hazards List  
Preliminary Critical Items List (CIL)  
Status of As-Built Reference Interface Drawings  
Special Construction Inspection Requirements  
Design Safety Considerations

#### VII. COST

Baseline Construction Estimate  
Design/Construction Cost Estimates  
Breakdown of Major Cost Elements including:  
    Element Cost Ranges/Uncertainties and Potential for Growth  
    Significant Cost Drivers  
    Potential Areas for Descoping or Bid Alternatives  
    Potential Areas for Design-, Furnish and Install Procurement  
    Overall Cost Assessment and Uncertainties/Concerns

## VIII. SCHEDULE

Project Level (with rationale)  
Major Element or Work Package Level  
Schedule Uncertainties/Concerns

## IX. SUMMARY

## PRELIMINARY DESIGN REVIEW (PDR)

### a. Description

#### (1) Objective (PDR)

The objective of the PDR is to validate the adequacy of the intended final design approaches as related to the functional design requirements according to applicable policies, design criteria and National Codes. The PDR will normally be scheduled when the final design is approximately 30 percent complete.

#### (2) Membership

(a) Chairperson: As designated by the Director, ~~SEC~~

(b) Secretary: Appointed by the Chairperson

(c) Members: LaRC Safety Manager; Facility Safety Head; Facility Coordinator; Cognizant Organization Manager; Deputy Director ~~for RFMO for Facility Systems~~; Capital Investment Planning Office Program Manager; technical experts as appropriate.

### b. Sample Agenda

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Scope of Review  
Status of Design  
Status of Action Items

#### II. PROJECT OVERVIEW

Research/Programmatic Requirements  
New Capability/Performance Desired  
Project Scope - CoF Funded Portion  
Project Scope - R&D Funded Portion

#### III. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Work Breakdown Structure  
Management Structure/Organization  
Roles and Responsibilities  
Project Controls and Status Reporting  
Configuration/Change Control, Requirements, Cost, Schedule  
Contingency Plans (regarding cost and schedule)

#### IV. DESIGN REQUIREMENTS/CONSTRAINTS

- System Interfaces Between Work Package
- System Interfaces With Existing Facility
- Elements of Interface Requirements Document
- Elements of Design Criteria Document including:
  - Software Requirements List
  - Programmatic Requirements/Objectives List
  - Engineering Requirements List
  - Design Load/Environments List

#### V. PRELIMINARY DESIGN

- Preliminary Design Concept Drawings
- Design Approach and Supporting Analyses
  - Architectural
  - Process Systems
  - Structural
  - Mechanical
  - Electrical
  - Controls and Associated Software
- Tradeoff Studies
- Areas of Technical Uncertainty/Risk
- Design Verification Test Results/Plans
- Performance Analyses
- Status Summary of Design Compliance with Design Criteria and Interface Requirements Document
- Project Definition Rating Index (PDRI) results

#### VI. SAFETY, RELIABILITY, AND QUALITY ASSURANCE

- Overview of SR&QA Approach During Design/Acquisition/Construction/ Checkout
- Hazard Analyses Results and Preliminary Critical Items List (CIL)
- Systems Safety Features Included in Design (interlocks, stops, and so forth)
- Implementation of SR&QA Plan
- Field Verification Status of Interface Drawings to be Referenced in Acquisition Package
- Potential Revisions and Additions to Existing Facilities-Facility Baseline List (FBL)
- Areas of Concern or Uncertainty

#### VII. COST

- Baseline Cost Estimate (PER)
- Current Cost Estimate and Rationale for any Cost Variations
- Cost Concerns/Uncertainties (design or construction)

## VIII. SCHEDULE

Project Level  
Work Package Level  
Status of Design Tasks Against Plan  
Schedule Concerns/Uncertainties (design or construction)

## IX. DOCUMENTATION TREE AND STATUS

Management Plan  
Cost and Schedule Reporting  
Standard Operating Procedures (SOP's)  
SR&QA Plan  
Inspection Plan  
Maintenance and In-Service Inspection Plan/Procedures  
Design Criteria Document  
Interface Requirements Document  
Configuration Control Plan  
Hazard Analyses and Critical Items List (CIL)  
CIL Installation Procedures  
Operational Checkout Plan/Procedures  
Software Management and Assurance Program  
Design Analyses

## X. SUMMARY

**CRITICAL DESIGN REVIEW (CDR)**a. Description

## (1) Objective (CDR)

The objective of the CDR is to assure that the design is complete and the project is ready to proceed to the acquisition and construction phase. The CDR will confirm that the final design fulfills the design requirements, utilizes good engineering practices, and adheres to applicable LaRC/NASA policies and National Codes. The CDR will be scheduled after the design has been completed and reviewed ~~by engineering line management~~, but prior to the initiation of the acquisition/construction phase.

## (2) Membership

(a) Chairperson: As designated by the Director, ~~SEC~~

(b) Secretary: Appointed by the Chairperson

(c) Members: LaRC Safety Manager; Facility Safety Head; Facility Coordinator; Cognizant Organization Manager; Deputy Director ~~for RFMO for Facility Systems~~; Capital Investment Planning Office Program Manager; technical experts as appropriate.

b. Sample Agenda

## I. INTRODUCTION

Scope of Review  
Status of Design  
Status of Action Items  
Agenda

## II. PROJECT OVERVIEW

Research/Programmatic Requirements  
New Capability/Performance Desired  
Roles and Responsibilities  
Project Scope - CoF Funded Portion  
Project Scope - R&D Funded Portion

## III. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Work Breakdown Structure  
Management Structure/Organization  
Overview of Acquisition Plan  
Acquisition Package(s) Status

#### IV. DESIGN REQUIREMENTS/CONSTRAINTS

- System Interfaces Between Work Packages
- System Interfaces With Existing Facility
- Elements of Interface Requirements Document
- Elements of Design Criteria Document (includes Functional Requirements)
  - Software Requirements List
  - Programmatic Requirements/Objectives List
  - Engineering Requirements List
  - Design Load/Environments List

#### V. FINAL DESIGN

- Final Design Drawings
- Block Diagrams and Schematics
- Design Details and Supporting Analyses ~~include~~including:
  - Architectural/Structural/Mechanical/Electrical/Process Systems
  - Control and Associated Software
- Performance Analyses
- Maintainability, Repairability, and Operability
- Producibility and Manufacturing Readiness
- Human Engineering/Accessibility
- Mock-ups, Breadboards, and/or Prototype Hardware
- List of equipment to be added or removed from facility.
- Design Verification Test Results
- Summary of Design Compliance with Elements of Design Criteria and Interface Requirements Documents
- Areas of Technical Uncertainty/Risk

#### VI. SAFETY, RELIABILITY, AND QUALITY ASSURANCE

- Status of Safety, Reliability, and Quality Assurance (SR&QA) Activities
- Verification Status of Interface Reference Drawings
- Status of Facility Baseline List Drawings
- Independent Reviews of Drawings and Analyses
- Hazard Analyses and Updated Critical Items List (CIL)
- CIL As-Built Assurance Plan
- Systems Safety Features included in Design
- Overall SR&QA Assessment and Area of Concern/Uncertainty

#### VII. COST

- Baseline Cost Estimate (PER)
- Current Cost Estimate and Rationale for any Cost Variations
- Cost Concerns/Uncertainties

## VIII. SCHEDULE

Project Level, including Construction  
Work Package Level  
Design Completion and Preparation of Procurement Package  
Procurement Cycle  
Schedule Concerns/Uncertainties

## IX. DOCUMENTATION TREE AND STATUS

Management Plan  
Cost and Schedule Reporting  
Standard Operating Procedures (SOP's)  
SR&QA Plan  
Inspection Plan  
Maintenance and In-Service Inspection Plan/Procedures  
Design Criteria Document  
Interface Requirements Document  
Configuration Control Plan  
Hazard Analyses and Critical Items List (CIL)  
CIL Installation Procedures  
Operational Checkout Plan/Procedures  
Design Analyses

## X. SUMMARY



**INTEGRATED SYSTEMS REVIEW (ISR)**a. Description

## (1) Objective (ISR)

The objective of the ISR is to confirm that the construction has been successfully completed and that appropriate plans and preparations for shakedown have been developed. The ISR will normally be scheduled when the construction and systems level acceptance testing is approximately complete, but prior to initiation of integrated systems testing.

## (2) Membership

(a) Chairperson: As designated by the Director, **SEC**

(b) Secretary: Appointed by the Chairperson

(c) Members: Cognizant Organization Manager; Deputy Director **for RFMO-for-Facility Systems**; LaRC Safety Manager; Facility Safety Head; Facility Coordinator; Chairperson, Systems Operations Committee (see LAPD 1150.2); technical experts as appropriate.

## (3) Action

The Chairperson is to provide a written statement to the cognizant Competency Director certifying it is acceptable to initiate system level checkout and test programs. All board members will receive a copy of this written statement.

b. Sample Agenda

## I. INTRODUCTION

Objective and Scope of Review  
Agenda

## II. PROJECT OVERVIEW

Research/Programmatic Requirements  
Description of Construction Project and Functional Operation of Facility  
Top Level Schedule and Status  
Summary of Prior Reviews of All Types  
Status of Open Action Items from Design Reviews

### III. CONSTRUCTION

- Overview and Overall Status of Construction
- Detailed Discussion of Facility Components/Systems/Controls
- Brief Descriptions of Specifications by Which Item was Procured/Constructed
- Changes in the CDR Design and the Independent Reviewing Body for Each
- Summary of all Qualification, Proof, and/or Acceptance Testing Performed and Results
- Summary of As-Built Compliance with Contractual Requirements
- Status of Construction Contract(s) and Contract Submittals (including as-built drawings)
- Concern, Limitations, and Potential Problem Areas

### IV. DOCUMENTATION

- Overall Documentation Required (documentation tree):
  - Design Related
  - Safety, Reliability, and Quality Assurance (SR&QA) Related
  - Construction Related
  - Test Related
  - Management Related
- Status Summary

### V. FACILITY SHAKEDOWN

- Overview of Objectives
- Management Structure/Organization, Roles, and Responsibilities
- Operating Personnel Readiness (includes training and certification)
- Field Verification Status of Facility Baseline List (FBL) As-Built Drawings
- Details of Shakedown Plan
  - Tasks
  - Operating Procedures (Standard and Test Unique)
  - Configuration Management Procedures
  - Test Instrumentation and Data Reduction
  - Schedule
- Areas of Concern/Uncertainty

### VI. SAFETY, RELIABILITY, AND QUALITY ASSURANCE

- Overview of Facility Safety Program, Special Studies, and Safety Reviews
- Safety Analysis Report/Operational Hazard Analyses (including Software and Shakedown Unique Configurations and Operations)
- Critical Items List (CIL)
- Critical Interlocks
- Quality Assurance/Inspection Utilized and any Deviations Accepted (general items, critical items, and critical interlocks)
- Status of Open Items from Safety/Hazard Analysis Reviews
- Overall SR&QA Assessment and Areas of Concern/Uncertainty

VII. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF READINESS FROM INTEGRATED SYSTEMS  
TESTING

Hardware  
Software  
Personnel  
Open Items  
Concerns

## **OPERATIONAL READINESS REVIEW (ORR)**

### **a. Description**

#### **(1) Objective (ORR)**

(a) The objective of the ORR is to verify that shakedown has been satisfactorily completed and that the facility is ready to begin normal operations. The ORR will determine whether the shakedown tests demonstrated that the facility meets its performance requirements, all applicable documentation has been completed, and that the facility is adequately staffed and prepared for normal operations.

(b) The ORR will normally be scheduled when the integrated system level test program is completed, but prior to initial research operation of the facility.

#### **(2) Membership**

(a) Chairperson: As designated by the Competency Director responsible for facility

(b) Co-Chairperson: As designated by the Director, ~~SEC~~

(c) Secretary: Appointed by the Chairperson

(d) Members: Chairperson, Systems Operations Committee (see LAPD 1150.2); LaRC Safety Manager; Facility Safety Head; Facility Coordinator; technical experts as appropriate.

#### **(3) Action**

(a) Prior to the ORR, the Chairperson, and an appointed committee composed of at least three ORR members, will conduct a final "walk-through" of the new/modified facility to:

(i) Certify that the facility is operational.

(ii) List all observed safety and quality assurance deficiencies.

(iii) Verify that all prior corrective actions have been incorporated.

(b) The Chairperson is to provide a written statement to the LaRC Deputy Director certifying that the facility is acceptable and recommending that the facility be declared operational. All panel members will receive a copy of this written statement.

b. Sample Agenda

I. INTRODUCTION

Objective and Scope of Review  
Agenda

II. PROJECT OVERVIEW

Research/Program Requirements  
Project Scope and Status Summary  
Top Level Schedule and Summary  
Status of Open Action Items from Prior Formal Reviews

III. INTEGRATED SYSTEMS TESTING

Test Results Against Plan  
Verification of Critical Interlocks  
Resolution of Problems/Failures  
Configuration Changes  
    Documentation  
    Hardware  
    Software  
Summary of Overall Project Compliance with Requirements

IV. DOCUMENTATION

Status of Overall Project Documentation Against Requirements  
Archival Responsibilities and Status

V. OPERATIONS PROCEDURES

Roles and Responsibilities  
Typical Sequence of Events and Verification of Standard Operating Procedures (SOP's)  
Emergency Procedures

VI. SAFETY, RELIABILITY, AND QUALITY ASSURANCE

Safety Analysis Changes Since ISR  
Safety Compliance Verification  
Personnel Training and Certification  
Quality Assurance and Compliance with Specifications  
Configuration Management  
Open Items

## VII. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF OPERATIONAL READINESS

Hardware

Software

Personnel

Procedures/Documentation

|

## ~~GENERAL REQUIREMENTS (Item/Responsibility)~~

### ~~a.——Special Reviews~~

~~The Chairperson of each review or the cognizant LaRC Competency Director may also establish other special reviews to supplement the above reviews.~~

### ~~b.——Support~~

~~(1)——LaRC Competency Directors are to support the above reviews by furnishing senior personnel experienced in the required technical disciplines.~~

~~(2)——The Chairperson of each review is to organize each panel and draw support from NASA Headquarters, other Centers, industry, or other Federal agencies when applicable.~~

### ~~c.——Scheduling~~

~~The Project Manager, or equivalent, is responsible for contacting the designated Chairperson to request and set a desired review date that allows sufficient time for orderly preparation. A tentative agenda, with allotted times, will accompany this request.~~

### ~~d.——Notification~~

~~Notification of a review is initiated by letter from the review Chairperson to appropriate distribution which identifies:~~

~~(1)——Review objectives.~~

~~(2)——Date, time, and place.~~

~~(3)——Committee members.~~

~~(4)——Action Item Coordinator.~~

~~(5)——Tentative agenda with allotted times.~~

### ~~e.——Review Material~~

~~Review material is to be distributed by review initiator to all panel members prior to the scheduled review date.~~

### ~~f.——Action Items~~

~~Issues and questions which cannot be readily addressed at the review shall be documented on Langley Form 6, "Request for Action," and assigned to an appropriate individual for closure. The Review Panel will screen all submitted RFA's at the end of the review for completeness, elimination, or consolidation, as appropriate. The Project Manager, in conjunction with the Design Review Chairperson, will assign Action Item responsibilities and due dates on the RFA~~

~~forms. The Action Item Coordinator will be responsible for administratively tracking and routing all documentation necessary for closure of the review Action Items.~~

~~g. — Action Item Closure~~

~~(1) — Action Item assignees shall send responses to the Action Item Coordinator for logging and routing by the specified due date. Closure of the Action Item requires the review (acceptance or rejection) by the RFA originator and approval of the Review Panel Chairperson. Failure of the originator to respond to the proposed Action Item closure within 10 working days will infer acceptance. A copy of all Action Item closures will be sent to the review panel members.~~

~~(2) — The Action Item assignee's line management is responsible for assuring the resolution of Action Items.~~

~~h. — Minutes~~

~~Minutes of each review, including Action Items, are to be distributed by the Secretary to the Panel members, appropriate organizational heads and Competency Directors, and Correspondence and Records Management (C&RM), Office of Logistics Management Office (OLM).~~